

# **City of Greenville**

# **Design Review Board – Neighborhood Design Panel**Minutes of the **March 30, 2021** Agenda Workshop Meeting

# **Webex Virtual Meeting**

Meeting Notice Posted on Wednesday, March 17, 2021 Minutes prepared by Austin Rutherford

Members Present: Fred Guthier, Matt Tindall, Monica Baretta, Allison Tucker

Members Absent: Jermaine Johnson

Staff Present: Jay Graham, Planning and Development Director; Logan Wells, Assistant

City Attorney; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Courtney Powell, Planning Administrator; Kris Kurjiaka, Senior Development Planner; Harold Evangelista, Development Planner; Ross Zelenske, Development Planner; Austin Rutherford, Development Planner; Edward Kinney, Senior

Landscape Architect

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 12:02 PM

**Agenda Workshop:** The DRB-Neighborhood Panel received an overview from staff on the following applications, which were scheduled for the public hearing on April 1, 2021.

#### **Old Business**

#### A. None

## **New Business**

#### A. APL 21-124

Application by **TIM KEARNS to APPEAL** the administrator's decision on CAS 21-75 to approve with conditions exterior modifications at 126 James Street (TM# 003000-01-00100).

Development planner Matt Lonnerstater gave an overview of this application. This overview included the original conditions of approval for CAS 21-75, the updates that the applicant completed without issued approval that was addressed by an after-the-fact CA application, and staff's decisions on this application. Mr. Lonnerstater emphasized that the DRB's job in this appeal is to determine whether or not the administrator administered the correct decision based on the guidelines at the time of the decision. No new information is to be considered. Staff recommends affirmation of the administrator's decision.

Development Planner Austin Rutherford noted that the applicant requested deferral, but per the land management ordinance a deferral is not allowed.

Assistant City Attorney Logan Wells confirmed that a vote must be taken on the applicant's request for deferral.

Staff concluded that the deferral shall be voted on when the item appears and before the staff report during the next meeting.

Mr. Guthier emphasized that the motion on this item should reference specific guidelines used to enforce the decision.

#### B. CA 21-158

Application by **TIM KEARNS for a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for exterior modifications and additions to an existing structure at 211 W. Earle Street. (TM# 00800-04-00600).

Mr. Rutherford provided an overview for this application. He highlighted that more detail will be delivered at the following meeting. Staff recommends denial.

Ms. Baretta inquired about whether or not the columns in the front of the house are original or not. Mr. Rutherford noted that they were probably not original, as the second story porch was mostly removed.

Mr. Guthier inquired about any work already done to this property. Mr. Rutherford answered that there has been internal demolition.

Mr. Tindall requested information about denial of the attached garage. Mr. Rutherford pulled up the design guidelines that dictate attached vs detached garage structures and emphasized that attached garages should only occur when a detached garage is not possible due to site conditions.

## C. CA 21-159

Application by **TIM KEARNS** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for exterior modifications and additions to an existing structure and after-the-fact demolition of a shed/garage at 215 W. Earle Street. (TM# 00800-04-00700).

Mr. Rutherford gave an application overview for this item. Staff recommends denial due to inconsistencies with the design guidelines. He noted that the site plans are not survey-based and do not include property lines.

## Other Business (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None.

## Advice and Comment (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None

## **Informal Review (Not a Public Hearing):**

A. None

The members present discussed and reviewed materials for the application indicated above. No action or votes were taken on any agenda item. No public hearing was conducted, and no public comments were received.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 12:28 PM.